

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application of:	)	
	)	
KRULL, JAY DEE	)	Attorney Docket No.:
	)	702.152
Serial No.: 10/032,032	)	
	)	
Filed: December 21, 2001	)	Group Art Unit No. 3661
	)	
PDA WITH INTEGRATED ADDRESS BOOK	)	
AND ELECTRONIC MAP WAYPOINTS	)	Examiner: CAMBY, R. M.

**APPEAL BRIEF**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application of:	)	
	)	
KRULL, JAY DEE	)	Attorney Docket No.:
	)	702.152
Serial No.: 10/032,032	)	
	)	
Filed: December 21, 2001	)	Group Art Unit No. 3661
	)	
PDA WITH INTEGRATED ADDRESS BOOK	)	
AND ELECTRONIC MAP WAYPOINTS	)	Examiner: CAMBY, R. M.

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL**

In response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief, Appellant's brief on Appeal in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 is hereby submitted. The Examiner's rejections of claims 1-22 and 28-38 are herein appealed, and allowance of said claims is respectfully requested.

The requisite fee as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.20 was submitted on June 13, 2006. Any additional fee which is due in connection with this amendment should be applied against our Deposit Account No. 501-791.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /David L. Terrell/  
David L. Terrell, Reg. No. 50,576  
Garmin International, Inc.  
1200 East 151<sup>st</sup> Street  
Olathe, KS 66062  
(913) 397-8200  
(913) 397-9079 (Fax)

Following are the requisite statements under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37:

**I. Real Party in Interest**

Jay Dee Krull, Michael Childs, Matt Burch, Ben Jones, and Paul McAllister are the inventors of the claimed invention. The inventors assigned the above-referenced application to Garmin Ltd., the Real Party in Interest.

**II. Related Appeals and Interferences**

No related appeals or interferences are known to the Appellants which may directly affect or be directly affected on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**III. Status of Claims**

Claims 1-22 and 28-38 stand rejected and appealed. Claims 23, 25, and 27 have been allowed. Claims 24, 26, and 39 have been canceled.

**IV. Status of Amendments**

All amendments submitted by the Appellant have been entered.

**V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The present invention is drawn to integrating capabilities of GPS and electronic map technologies with PDA functions. The present invention integrates a PDA address book function with an electronic map and GPS capabilities. The present invention is capable of

associating an address with a position such as that provided by latitude and longitude coordinates for two dimensions, and an altitude value for three dimensions. A position is capable of being identified from an address, and an address is capable of being identified or estimated from a location.

Figures 1A-1C illustrate views for a personal digital assistant (PDA) with integrated Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver. As shown in the front view of Figure 1A, the GPS integrated PDA 110 includes a GPS antenna, illustrated in this embodiment as an internal integrated GPS patch antenna 114 contained within a housing 118.

Figure 2 is a block diagram of components in one PDA embodiment. In one embodiment, the electronic circuit for a PDA with an integrated GPS receiver includes a processor 236 that is coupled with memory 242, and power source 246 for powering the electronic components of the PDA. The processor 236 communicates with a touch sensitive display screen 226. The electronic circuit further includes two other input sources that are connected to the processor 236. Control buttons 228 are connected to processor 236 via line 250 and a map data cartridge 233 inserted into cartridge bay 232 is connected via line 252. The PDA is integrated with GPS capabilities using a GPS receiver 238. A GPS antenna 214 is connected to the GPS receiver 238, and the GPS receiver 238 is connected to the processor 236 via line 240.

Specifically, claim 1 claims a method comprising the steps of “identifying a location”, as shown in step 1010 of Figure 10; “associating a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) address book entry with the location to form a waypoint”, as shown in step 1012 of Figure

10; and “wherein the location is identified and the PDA address book entry is associated therewith within one portable hand-held device, thereby integrating PDA address book functions with Global Positioning System (GPS) capabilities in a single device”. Figure 10 is discussed on pages 16 and 17 of the specification. As stated on pages 7-9, the present invention “integrates a PDA address book function with an electronic map and GPS capabilities” and discloses “a personal digital assistant (PDA) with integrated Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver”. Page 7. Specifically, “the GPS integrated PDA 110 includes a GPS antenna, illustrated in this embodiment as an internal integrated GPS patch antenna 114 contained within a housing 118”. *Id.*

Similarly, claim 7 claims a method comprising the steps of “selecting a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) address book entry”, as shown in step 910 of Figure 9; “associating a location with the PDA address book entry to form a waypoint” , as shown in step 912 of Figure 9; and “wherein the location is associated with the PDA address book entry within one portable hand-held device, thereby integrating PDA address book functions with Global Positioning System (GPS) capabilities in a single device”. Figure 9 is discussed on pages 15 and 16 of the specification. As discussed above, pages 7-9 discuss “integrating PDA address book functions with Global Positioning System (GPS) capabilities in a single device”, as claimed.

Finally, claim 28 claims a PDA “with an integrated electronic map and address book, comprising”: “a processor”, as shown by numeral 236 in Figure 2; and “a memory adapted to communicate to the processor”, as shown by numeral 242 in Figure 2, “wherein the

memory includes address book data and electronic map data, wherein the device is adapted to associate a location that is capable of being displayed on the electronic map with a PDA address book entry to form a waypoint". Figures 2 and 3 are discussed on pages 9-11. Figure 3 depicts an address list screen showing "a waypoint indicator 320 which indicates that the address associated with corresponding name has been saved as a waypoint for use in electronic map". Page 10. "A waypoint, in general, can be any identified location such as coordinates or an electronic map feature". *Id.*

Figures 13-26, discussed on pages 20-24, show various PDA address book entries in combination with electronic map data and associating PDA address book entries with locations, in some instances to form waypoints. Figures 7 and 8, discussed on pages 13-15, and Figures 11 and 12, discussed on pages 18-20, describe how such associations may be made.

Claim 14 recites "A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions adapted to associate a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) address book entry with a location on an electronic map that is capable of being displayed on the PDA". Page 25 states "methods provided above are implemented as a set of instructions contained on a computer-accessible medium, such as memory 242 in Figure 2, capable of directing a processor, such as processor 236 in Figure 2, to perform the respective method".

## **VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

Claims 1-22 and 28-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokoyama, U.S. Patent No. 5,654,908. Applicant appeals from this ground for rejection.

## **VII. Argument**

### **A. Summary of Arguments**

Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to cite prior art references that either teach each claim limitation or provide the requisite motivation or suggestion for modifying Yokoyama to include the limitations. In fact, Yokoyama teaches away from the claimed invention, and therefore there can be no suggestion to make the Examiner's proposed modification.

### **B. Summary of Yokoyama Reference**

Yokoyama teaches that "the diary 10 can be held in the hand" and "the navigation apparatus 50 is mounted in a motor vehicle". Column 3. "As shown in the drawing, navigation apparatus 50 is mounted in a motor vehicle C". *Id.* "The electronic diary 10 transmits the data which specifies a selected destination ... to navigation apparatus 50 via radio waves or the like, when a user M selects the desired destination [on the diary 10]. Having received the destination data, the navigation apparatus 50 establishes the intended

route to the destination, ready for guiding the user M along the route when user M gets into the motor vehicle”. *Id.* “FIG. 2 shows the relationship between the electronic diary 10 and navigation apparatus 50”. *Id.* Thus, Yokoyama explicitly teaches that his diary 10 is hand-held and remote from his navigation apparatus 50 which is mounted in the vehicle ready and waiting there for the user.

This configuration allows the user to remotely send the destination data to the navigation apparatus 50 and let it calculate the route, while the diary 10 is free to handle other tasks. In other words, Yokoyama’s diary 10 is never tied up calculating the route, and is therefore free to provide separate functionality. For example, as shown in Figure 8, upon receiving the destination data, the navigation apparatus 50 wakes up, determines where it is, determines the route to the destination, and then shuts itself down to await the arrival of the user. As shown in Figure 9, upon the user starting the motor vehicle, the navigation apparatus 50 again wakes up and guides the user along the route. Thus, Yokoyama explicitly teaches a diary 10 that is hand held and a completely separate navigation apparatus 50 that is purposefully permanently mounted in the motor vehicle.

This distribution of functionality is not required by space limitations. Rather, as discussed above, Yokoyama teaches specific utility in his diary 10 being portable and traveling with the user. Yokoyama further teaches specific utility in his navigation apparatus 50 operating within his vehicle, separately and independently from his diary 10. Furthermore, Yokoyama is devoid of any suggestion of space limitations. Thus,



Yokoyama's distribution of functionality is not required by space limitations and space limitations would not motivate any modification of Yokoyama.

### **C. Legal Discussion of Obviousness**

Obviousness can be a problematic basis for rejection because the Examiner, in deciding that a feature is obvious, has the benefit of the applicant's disclosure as a blueprint and guide. In contrast, one with ordinary skill in the art would have no such guide, in which light even an exceedingly complex solution may seem easy or obvious. Furthermore, once an obviousness rejection has been made, the applicant is in the exceedingly difficult position of having to prove a negative proposition (i.e., non-obviousness) in order to overcome the rejection.

For these reasons, the law places upon the Examiner the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. If the Examiner fails to establish the requisite *prima facie* case, the rejection is improper and will be overturned. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Only if the Examiner's burden is met does the burden shift to the Applicant to provide evidence to refute the rejection.

In meeting this initial burden, the Examiner "cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention." *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Thus, the Examiner is required to perform the "critical step" of casting his or her mind back to the time of invention, to consider the thinking of one of ordinary skill in the art, guided only by

the prior art references and the then-accepted wisdom in the field. *See, e.g., W. L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1553, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Rejections on obviousness grounds also cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 U.S.P.Q.2d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2006). The factual inquiry performed by the Examiner in issuing an obviousness rejection must be thorough and searching. *McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1339, 1351-52, 60 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 2001). The prohibition against conclusory examination is as much rooted in the Administrative Procedure Act, which ensures due process and non-arbitrary decision-making, as it is in § 103. *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d at 988.

Three criteria must be satisfied by the Examiner in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine their teachings; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the combination of references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP § 706.02(j), *citing In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 493, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). This "motivation-suggestion-teaching" requirement protects against the entry of hindsight into the obviousness analysis, a problem which § 103 was meant to confront. *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d at 988.

Consequently, an Examiner's mere identification in the prior art of each individual

element claimed is insufficient to defeat the patentability of a claimed invention without a proper suggestion to combine or modify the elements. *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1998). The fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 902, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

In presenting the suggestion or motivation to combine prior art references, the Examiner may not resort to broad and conclusory statements; as such statements are not “evidence” of anything. *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 U.S.P.Q.2d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2000). The suggestion to make the claimed combination must be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d at 490. If the Examiner's proposed combination renders the prior art invention unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, or changes its principal of operation, there can be no suggestion or motivation to form the combination—and thus no *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2143.01; *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d at 902.

**D. The Examiner failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness as the cited references do not teach each claim limitation.**

The Examiner acknowledges that “Yokoyama lacks that the GPS capabilities are within the PDA device”. Final Office Action, dated February 3, 2006, Page 3.

- **Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites “wherein the location is identified and the PDA address book entry is associated therewith within one portable hand-held device”. In contrast, Yokoyama simply does not teach the limitations of claim 1. Rather, as shown in his Figure 2, Yokoyama teaches two separate devices. His diary 10 is used to identify a destination, by address, and that address is sent to his navigation apparatus 50, mounted in the vehicle. See Figure 2 and column 3, lines 42-46. His navigation apparatus 50 then associates the address with a location. See Figure 8, step s28, and column 6, lines 15-22, and column 7, lines 34-63. Thus, Yokoyama teaches one device to identify an address and a completely separate device, which is not hand-held, to associate a location with an address.

- **Claim 7**

Similarly, Claim 7 recites “wherein the location is associated with the PDA address book entry within one portable hand-held device”. In contrast, Yokoyama simply does not teach the limitations of claim 7. Rather, as discussed, Yokoyama teaches two separate devices, one device to identify an address and a completely separate device, which is not hand-held, to associate a location with an address.

- **Claim 14**

Claim 14 recites “[a] computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions adapted to associate a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) address book entry

with a location on ***an electronic map that is capable of being displayed on the PDA***", emphasis added. In contrast, Yokoyama's electronic diary 10 simply cannot display any map. Rather, Yokoyama requires his navigation apparatus 50 to display any maps. See Column 8. However, the navigation apparatus 50 does not provide any PDA functionality, and therefore cannot be analogous to a PDA.

- **Claims 15-17**

Claim 15 recites "wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to identify the location based on a GPS-determined current location and then to create the PDA address book entry to be associated with the identified location to form a waypoint". Claim 16 recites "wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to identify the location based on a cursor position on the electronic map and then to create the PDA address book entry to be associated with the identified location to form a waypoint". Claim 17 recites "wherein the location is associated with electronic map feature data, and wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to pre-fill the PDA address book entry using the electronic map feature data associated with the location". These claims each recite some form of creating a PDA address book entry using electronic map data.

In contrast, Yokoyama simply doesn't work that way. As discussed above, information from Yokoyama's electronic diary 10 is pushed to his navigation apparatus 50, not the other way around. Simply put, Yokoyama's navigation apparatus 50 does not

provide the electronic diary 10 with any electronic map data that could be used in creating a PDA address book entry. In fact, the Examiner never even asserts Yokoyama teaches or suggests these limitations. Specifically, the Examiner fails to address the limitations of the dependent claims.

- **Claims 19-21**

Claim 19 recites “wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to create the PDA address book entry, and then associate a location with the PDA address book entry to form a waypoint”. Claim 20 recites “wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to display the waypoint on the electronic map”. Claim 21 recites “wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to provide route guidance to the waypoint”. Thus, these claims explicitly require the same set of computer instructions that associates “a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) address book entry with a location on an electronic map that is capable of being displayed on the PDA”, as claimed in claim 14, to also form, display, and/or route to the waypoint. As discussed above, Yokoyama requires multiple components to provide this functionality. In fact, the Examiner never even asserts Yokoyama teaches or suggests these limitations. Specifically, the Examiner fails to address the limitations of the dependent claims.

- **Claim 28**

Claim 28 recites “[a] Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) device with an integrated electronic map and address book” and “***wherein the device is adapted to associate a location that is capable of being displayed on the electronic map with a PDA address book entry to form a waypoint***”, emphasis added.

In contrast, as discussed above, Yokoyama requires his navigation apparatus 50 to provide mapping capabilities, which his electronic diary 10 cannot provide. Simply put, as previously argued, Yokoyama fails to disclose integration of the claimed functionality, such as associating locations with address book entries, into one device.

- **Claims 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, and 37**

Claim 30 recites “wherein the device is adapted to pre-fill data fields in the PDA address book entry with electronic map data associated with the location”. Claim 32 recites “wherein the device is adapted to create the PDA address book entry, and then identify the location associated with the PDA address book entry”. Claim 33 recites “wherein the device is adapted to route to the waypoint on the electronic map”. Claim 35 recites “a Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver integral to the PDA”. Claim 36 recites “wherein the location associated with the PDA address book entry is determined by a GPS-determined location of the GPS receiver”. Claim 37 recites “wherein the location associated with the PDA address book entry is determined by a cursor position on the electronic map”.

In contrast, as discussed above, Yokoyama requires his navigation apparatus 50 to provide mapping capabilities, which his electronic diary 10 cannot provide. Simply put, as previously argued, Yokoyama fails to disclose integration of the claimed functionality, such as GPS capabilities, routing capabilities, map data manipulation, and associating locations with address book entries, into one device. In fact, the Examiner never even asserts Yokoyama teaches or suggests these limitations. Specifically, the Examiner fails to address the limitations of the dependent claims.

**E. The Examiner failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness as the prior art does not provide the requisite motivation or suggestion for modifying Yokoyama to include the limitations.**

The Examiner argues that “[t]his combination of devices is considered obvious in light of the ability of technology to shrink electronics and provide more in a small space and cut down on communication costs”. Final Office Action, dated February 3, 2006, Page 3. The Examiner also argues “that since old technology requires 2 devices because of space limitations that this does not teach away from advancement”. *Id.*

However, such arguments ignore the explicit teachings of Yokoyama. Specifically, as discussed above, Yokoyama teaches that “the diary 10 can be held in the hand” and “the navigation apparatus 50 is mounted in a motor vehicle”. Column 3. “The electronic diary 10 transmits the data which specifies a selected destination ... to navigation apparatus 50 via radio waves or the like, when a user M selects the desired destination [on



the diary 10]. Having received the destination data, the navigation apparatus 50 establishes the intended route to the destination, ready for guiding the user M along the route when user M gets into the motor vehicle". *Id.* Thus, Yokoyama explicitly teaches that his diary 10 is hand-held and remote from his navigation apparatus 50 which is mounted in the vehicle ready and waiting there for the user.

This configuration allows the user to remotely send the destination data to the navigation apparatus 50 and let it calculate the route, while the diary 10 is free to handle other tasks. In other words, Yokoyama's diary 10 is never tied up calculating the route, and is therefore free to provide separate functionality. For example, as shown in Figure 8, upon receiving the destination data, the navigation apparatus 50 wakes up, determines where it is, determines the route to the destination, and then shuts itself down to await the arrival of the user. As shown in Figure 9, upon the user starting the motor vehicle, the navigation apparatus 50 again wakes up and guides the user along the route. Thus, Yokoyama explicitly teaches a diary 10 that is hand held and a completely separate navigation apparatus 50 that is purposefully permanently mounted in the motor vehicle.

This distribution of functionality is not required by space limitations, as suggested by the Examiner. Rather, as discussed above, Yokoyama teaches specific utility in his diary 10 being portable and traveling with the user. Yokoyama further teaches specific utility in his navigation apparatus 50 operating within his vehicle, separately and independently from his diary 10. Furthermore, Yokoyama is devoid of any suggestion of space limitations.

Thus, “the ability of technology to shrink electronics and provide more in a small space and cut down on communication costs” would not motivate any modification of Yokoyama.

Furthermore, the Examiner’s assertion would only support making Yokoyama’s diary 10 and navigation apparatus 50 smaller and cheaper. Such an ability of technology does not suggest combining devices previously explicitly taught to be distinctly separate with each piece having separate utility, not to mention specific utility in their being separate. Such an inference, if permissible, would completely eliminate the burden the courts have placed on the Examiner, in interpreting 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Thus, neither Yokoyama nor the Examiner’s reference to an “ability of technology” provides the requisite motivation for modifying Yokoyama to include the functionality claimed in claims 1-22 and 28-38 into one device. As a result, Yokoyama simply fails to disclose, suggest, or make obvious the limitations of the currently pending claims.

**F. The Examiner failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness as Yokoyama actually teaches away from any modification to include the limitations.**

As discussed above, the Examiner argues “that since old technology requires 2 devices because of space limitations that this does not teach away from advancement”. Final Office Action, dated February 3, 2006, Page 3. However, Yokoyama teaches that “the diary 10 can be held in the hand” and “the navigation apparatus 50 is mounted in a motor vehicle”. Column 3. Thus, rather than succumbing to space limitations, Yokoyama

explicitly teaches that his diary 10 is carried around by the user and his navigation apparatus 50 is to be mounted in the vehicle ready and waiting there for the user.

As discussed above, Yokoyama teaches specific utility in his diary 10 being portable and traveling with the user. Yokoyama further teaches specific utility in his navigation apparatus 50 operating within his vehicle, separately and independently from his diary 10. Finally, combining the two into one device, as the Examiner suggests, would necessarily impede the independent functionality of Yokoyama's diary 10. As a result, since Yokoyama teaches specific utility for his configuration, and the Examiner's modification could not provide that utility, Yokoyama teaches away from the Examiner's modifications.

### **G. Conclusion**

The Examiner failed, with regard to the rejection of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), to establish the requisite *prima facie* case of obviousness because the cited references do not teach each claim limitation or provide the requisite motivation or suggestion for modifying Yokoyama to include the limitations. In fact, Yokoyama teaches away from the Examiner's proposed modification, and therefore there can be no suggestion to make the Examiner's proposed modification. Finally, as discussed above, the Examiner fails to even assert that Yokoyama teaches the limitations of the dependent claims. As the Examiner failed to establish the requisite *prima facie* case of obviousness, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) cannot be sustained and must be overturned.

Accordingly, reversal of the Examiner's rejections is proper, and such favorable

Appeal of U.S. Application No. 10/032,032

action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /David L. Terrell/  
David L. Terrell, Reg. No. 50,576  
Garmin International, Inc.  
1200 East 151<sup>st</sup> Street  
Olathe, KS 66062  
(913) 397-8200  
(913) 397-9079 (Fax)

## **VIII. Claims Appendix**

1. (Previously Presented) A method, comprising:  
identifying a location;  
associating a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) address book entry with the location  
to form a waypoint; and  
wherein the location is identified and the PDA address book entry is associated  
therewith within one portable hand-held device, thereby integrating PDA  
address book functions with Global Positioning System (GPS) capabilities  
in a single device.
2. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein identifying a location includes identifying  
a location based on electronic map data.
3. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein identifying a location includes identifying  
a location based on a GPS-determined current location.
4. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein identifying a location includes identifying  
a location based on electronic map data and a cursor position on the electronic map.

5. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising:  
identifying electronic map feature data associated with the location; and  
pre-filling the PDA address book entry using the electronic map feature data  
associated with the location.
6. (Original) The method of claim 5, further comprising editing the pre-filled PDA  
address book entry.
7. (Previously Presented) A method, comprising:  
selecting a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) address book entry;  
associating a location with the PDA address book entry to form a waypoint; and  
wherein the location is associated with the PDA address book entry within one  
portable hand-held device, thereby integrating PDA address book functions  
with Global Positioning System (GPS) capabilities in a single device.
8. (Original) The method of claim 7, wherein selecting a PDA address book entry  
includes creating the PDA address book entry.
9. (Original) The method of claim 7, wherein associating a location with the PDA  
address book entry includes creating a new waypoint from electronic map data.

10. (Original) The method of claim 7, further comprising performing an application using the waypoint.
11. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein performing an application using the waypoint further includes displaying route guidance to the waypoint.
12. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein performing an application using the waypoint further includes providing verbal route guidance to the waypoint.
13. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7, wherein associating a location with the PDA address book entry to form a waypoint includes associating a user-selectable symbol with the waypoint.
14. (Original) A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions adapted to associate a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) address book entry with a location on an electronic map that is capable of being displayed on the PDA.
15. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 14, wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to identify the location based on a GPS-determined current location and then to create the PDA address book entry to be associated with the identified location to form a waypoint.

16. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 14, wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to identify the location based on a cursor position on the electronic map and then to create the PDA address book entry to be associated with the identified location to form a waypoint.

17. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 14, wherein the location is associated with electronic map feature data, and wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to pre-fill the PDA address book entry using the electronic map feature data associated with the location.

18. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 17, wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to allow the pre-filled address book entry to be edited.

19. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 14, wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to create the PDA address book entry, and then associate a location with the PDA address book entry to form a waypoint.

20. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 19, wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to display the waypoint on the electronic map.



21. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 19, wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to provide route guidance to the waypoint.

22. (Previously Presented) The computer-readable medium of claim 14, wherein the computer-executable instructions are further adapted to associate a user-selectable symbol with the location.

28. (Original) A Personal Digital Assistant (PDA) device with an integrated electronic map and address book, comprising:

a processor; and

a memory adapted to communicate to the processor,

wherein the memory includes address book data and electronic map data,

wherein the device is adapted to associate a location that is capable of being displayed on the electronic map with a PDA address book entry to form a waypoint.

29. (Original) The PDA device of claim 28, wherein the memory includes a map data cartridge on which the electronic map data is stored.

30. (Original) The PDA device of claim 28, wherein the device is adapted to pre-fill data fields in the PDA address book entry with electronic map data associated with the location.

31. (Original) The PDA device of claim 30, wherein the device is adapted to allow the pre-filled PDA address book entry to be edited.

32. (Original) The PDA device of claim 28, wherein the device is adapted to create the PDA address book entry, and then identify the location associated with the PDA address book entry.

33. (Original) The PDA device of claim 28, wherein the device is adapted to route to the waypoint on the electronic map.

34. (Original) The PDA device of claim 28, wherein the device has wireless communication capabilities.

35. (Previously Presented) The PDA device of claim 28, further comprising a Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver integral to the PDA and adapted to receive GPS signals, wherein the GPS receiver is adapted to communicate with the processor.

36. (Original) The PDA device of claim 35, wherein the location associated with the PDA address book entry is determined by a GPS-determined location of the GPS receiver.

37. (Original) The PDA device of claim 28, wherein the location associated with the PDA address book entry is determined by a cursor position on the electronic map.

38. (Original) The PDA device of claim 28, wherein the waypoint associated with the PDA address book entry is manually entered.

Appeal of U.S. Application No. 10/032,032

**IX. Evidence Appendix**

None.

Appeal of U.S. Application No. 10/032,032

**X. Related Proceedings Appendix**

None.